



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,757	12/20/2001	Tony Piotrowski	US010628	3946
24737	7590	05/17/2005	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ALAUBAIDI, HAYTHIM J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2161		

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/024,757	PIOTROWSKI, TONY	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Haythim J. Alaubaidi	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is a Non-Final Office Action in response to the RCE amendment of April 11, 2005.
2. Claims 1-19 stands present to be examined following the amendment of April 11, 2005, of which Claims 1, 7 and 15 are independent.
3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)
4. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
5. Claim 1-19, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.
6. Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).
7. Claims 2-3, 5, 8, 12, 16 and 18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

8. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 28, 2005 has been entered.

***Drawings***

9. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the

Specification: (199, 200, 110 and 120). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

10. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

11. Claims 1, 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In particular, the teachings for the limitation "searching one or more databases for the desired item or service in an offline process" contains conflicting process, as the database searching of the current invention according to the

Specification is being performed by some kind of a connection and not through an "offline process"; the Examiner would like to site the following areas of the current Application Specification to further point out that the searching is being conducted through the use of a communication line (online) and not through an offline process:

- a. Page 3, Lines 8-10;
- b. Page 5, Lines 13-15;
- c. Page 6, Lines 1-4, "offline process using a voice communication interface via a voice data packet". How can one purchase an item offline using a communication interface? By default, when a user is conducting a purchase process through the use of a communication then he/she is conducting an online purchase process;
- d. Page 10, Lines 16-18;
- e. Page 11, Lines 8-9;
- f. Page 12, Lines 9-14;
- g. Page 13, Lines 1-7 and Lines 17-19;
- h. Page 14, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph;
- i. Page 15, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph;
- j. Page 16, Lines 9-13; and
- k. Page 17, Lines 12-17.

The above citations from the current Application Specifications are clear indication that the search is being conducted in one of many ways that are online with the use of a communication. The Examiner is unable to understand the meaning of "offline" in the

Specification. The term "offline" in the art is well known as when a computer performs an operation when it is not connected to any other computers, it is working offline.

12. Claims 1, 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the limitation "searching one or more databases for the desired item or service in an offline process" is producing new matter. The limitation "searching one or more databases for the desired item or service" was not disclosed in the Specification of the current Application as an "offline process"; claiming such a search is being conducted as an offline process is considered new matter.

13. Dependent claims 2-5, 8-14 and 16-19 inherent the deficiencies of the Independent claims and therefor are also rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

14. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2161

15. Claims 1, 7 and 15 are rejected as there are insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the Specification of the current Application. In particular, the teachings for the limitation "searching one or more databases for the desired item or service in an offline process" cannot be found anywhere in the Specification of the current application. The Applicant provided Page 8, Line 23 through Page 9, Line 5 as the support for the amended limitation. The Examiner found no support for the combination of "searching one or more databases for the desired item or service" and the limitation of "in an offline process". The indicated pages (Page 8, Line 23 through Page 9, Line 5) by the Applicant supports only the "offline process" (which the Examiner gave a 112/1<sup>st</sup> paragraph for it) and not the "searching one or more databases". Support for the limitation "searching one or more databases" was found in:

- a. Page 3, Lines 2-3; and
- b. Page 3, Lines 18-19;

No mention to such a search being conducted in an offline process.

16. Dependent claims 2-5, 8-14 and 16-19 inherit the deficiencies of the Independent claims and therefore are also rejected.

17. Claim 19 recites the limitation "wherein the means for purchasing the desired item or service is performed with a purchase request from the user via an offline process". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the Specification of the current Application. The current Application Specification indicate that the purchase

Art Unit: 2161

order or request is being done through an audio (voice) from a user (see paragraphs [0017]-[0019]) using an on-line device. Reading the language of Claim 19, miss leads the Examiner and/or an ordinary skilled in the art that the purchase request is being requested through an offline process (meaning of offline process [0017]). In addition, the limitation language of the claim is being understood as a user requesting a purchase order without using any line connections (face to face with the merchant).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

18. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

19. Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stephan H. Maes (European Patent Application EP 1 143 679 and Maes hereinafter).

Regarding Claims 1, 7, 9-11, 15 and 17, Maes discloses:

receiving a voice data packet related to a desired item or service; (Figure 1, Elements No. 15, 16, 24, 21, 22 and 23 and corresponding text; see also Col 5, Paragraph [0019]);

that has been created from an input of audio data by a user (Figure No. 1, Element No. 16, i.e. conventional telephone);

forming a search request using information from the voice data packet, (Figure No. 3a, Element No. 105 and corresponding text; see also Col 9, Paragraph [0030]; see also Col 2, Paragraphs [0006] and [0007]);

the search request including audio information; (Figure No. 1, Element No 15 and 16 and corresponding text; see also Col 7, Paragraph [0024]);

searching one or more databases for the desired item or service; (Figure No 1, Elements No. 25 and 26 and corresponding text); and

providing a result of the search to the user (Col 21, Lines 27-31, i.e. search result; see also Figure 3a, Element 107 and corresponding text).

Regarding Claim 4, Maes discloses searching step includes searching one or more databases over the Internet (Figure No. 1 and corresponding text; see also Col 6, Paragraph [0023]).

Regarding Claim 6, Maes discloses verifying the user's identity using a voice authentication process (Col 21-22, Paragraph [0066]).

Regarding Claim 13, Maes discloses audio-to-text unit, wherein at least a portion of the search request includes electronic text data (Col 6-7, Paragraphs [0023] and [0024]).

Regarding Claim 14, Maes discloses a result indication formatter that formats the search results in a predetermined order (Col 11, Lines 4-12).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 2-3, 5, 8, 12, 16 and 18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephan H. Maes (European Patent Application EP 1 143 679 and Maes hereinafter) in view of Ronals A. Katz (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,513 and Katz hereinafter).

Regarding Claims 2 and 16, Maes's reference discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except it does not explicitly indicate wherein, the information includes one or more of the following types of information: consumer information, merchandize/service description, merchandize/service source, financial information and shipping information. However Katz discloses merchandize/service description (Katz,

Abstract, i.e. determining at least one good, service or item of information; see also Col 2, Lines 3-7; see also Col 24, Lines 4-11). Given the intended broad application of the Maes system, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Maes with the teachings of Katz to include an item description to be purchased or to identify the user purchasing the items or goods, one reason would be to complete the purchasing transaction, as identifying the items and/or good would result in completing the purchasing transaction if the voice or audio search request was in regard to purchasing an item or good or a service.

Regarding Claims 3, 8 and 18, Katz discloses completing a purchase transaction in an offline process; an "offline process" as defined by the Specification of the current Application (Paragraph [0017]) is processing the purchase order by the merchant once a request was received "not in real time" (Col 1, Lines 20-41; see also Col 2, Lines 34-54)<sup>1</sup>

Regarding Claim 5, Maes's reference discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except it does not explicitly indicate wherein the purchase transaction is a credit or debit card transaction. However Katz discloses wherein the purchase transaction is a credit or debit card transaction (Col 9, Lines 22-64). Given the intended broad application of the Maes system, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Maes with the teachings of Katz to include credit or debit transactions, one of many

reasons would be to increase the system flexibility and maximizing the consumer convenience by allowing the consumer to purchase a good or service using a credit or debit over the Internet instead of mailing cash or other type of checks to the provider of the good or services.

Regarding Claim 12, Maes discloses verifying the user's identity using a voice authentication process (Col 21-22, Paragraph [0066]).

***Points of Contact***

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haythim J. Alaubaidi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (571) 272-4023.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or telefax at our fax number (703) 872-9306.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that the Applicant's admitted prior art would also read on the limitations of these claims (see

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window of the Randolph Building at 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314

*Haythim J. Alaubaidi*

---

Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
5. Art Unit 2161

*Frantz Coby*  
**FRANTZ COBY**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

---

paragraph [0002]); in addition, processing an order offline by a merchant is a well known method and is being used well before the filing of the current application.